



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

pass clause of the recent Railroad Rates Act is a case in point (p. 72); also the statement that George Stephenson substituted steam for horse-power (pp. 25, 26), and on p. III whole series of decimal points have been overlooked by the proofreader with the result that the average passenger mile rates for Germany, Russia, and India are converted into 96 cents, 72 cents, and 5 cents.

Mr. Haines decries any attempt to determine the reasonableness of rates, but urges that the regulation of the law is wanted to regulate the relative incidence of rates upon communities with and without competitive roads. The latter task is no easier than the former.

He strongly believes in the substitution of federal supervision of railways for state supervision, but he is no supporter of federal ownership. There can be but little question that the movement of opinion is setting steadily in this direction, and that it will be to the advantage of the commerce of the country to be freed from the restrictions and incongruities of state control.

It will be gathered from the above that this volume deals with a large number of topics in connection with railway management and the facilities afforded. While these are not handled in detail, they are presented in an attractive way that ought to stimulate the interest of the general reading public in the question of the efficiency of the American railway service under its present organization.

ERNEST R. DEWSNUP

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Adam Smith and Modern Sociology. By ALBION W. SMALL.
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. London: T.
Fisher Unwin, 1907. Pp. ix+247.

In his searching analysis of the life and works of Adam Smith Dr. Small has several objects in view. He undertakes, for instance, to prove that Smith's *Wealth of Nations* was not merely a study of technical economics—a proposition which no one after reading Dr. Small's book can successfully dispute.

The author of the book has a fairly well-defined view, though not in detail the modern view of the general relations of human society and of the subordinate place occupied objectively, if not in conventional theory, by the economic section of activities to which the book is devoted.

Dr. Small further contends that the classical economists made an unwarranted departure from Smith's liberal programme—a point which, in the main, must be admitted.

Nearly the whole weight of the classical economists was cast into the balance on the side of the illusion that economic activities constitute a species of perpetual motion sufficient unto itself and that this sanctuary would be profaned if it were in any way disturbed by the other social interests.

The classical school selected the more abstract portions of the *Wealth of Nations*, developed them, elevated them into absolute economic principles, and then applied them with the devotion of the doctrinaire; in other words, they made the mistake of assuming that the economic measure of things and people was the real and ultimate measure. As Dr. Small puts it: "Economic theory became consequently a system which assumed the inviolability of the existing institutions of property in land and capital."

But the further question of the precise relation of political economy to sociology, Dr. Small does not so satisfactorily answer. Shall we say, as he apparently does, that political economy is merely a minor and technical, though of course an important, branch of sociology? If so, how shall we dispose of the department of the distribution of wealth, a division of the subject that is shot through and through with moral considerations? Dr. Small would no doubt agree with this view, only he would add, that when such relations enter into economic discussion there is no line of demarkation between sociology and economics. He would further add that as man cannot live by bread alone we must qualify his bread interests with his various other needs, all of which is most potently true and the critical reader will go a long way with Dr. Small. The economist may start resolutely with his definitions and cut out a definite field for himself, but he rarely remains strictly within the prescribed inclosure. Sooner or later he wanders into the broader domain of social relations. Nearly every economist is guilty of this ranging tendency from Malthus through Senior and Mill to Walker and Cairnes, and so by the way is the theologian, the physician, the jurist, and the military expert. The supreme interest of man is man. As long ago as Plato it was remarked that in our interest in the welfare of the state the principle of division of labor does not apply. We may be doctors or lawyers, farmers or ministers, by profession, but as members of society, interested in the state, we are just men.

Dr. Small in his extremely suggestive book puts the case very strongly, but while he clearly points out a number of trails, he does not follow them to the end. An adequate treatment of Adam Smith

would require a treatise. Even Smith's indebtedness to the physiocrats who undoubtedly had sociological notions of their own is by no means understood, or at least adequately stated. That he assumed the existence of a certain natural order of society whenever he analyzed economic conditions is no longer a matter of controversy.

It has been said that the minister who studies his Bible, and that only, does not understand it. However important technical economics may be in some of its phases, the science, as a whole, cannot be restricted merely to a question of technology. The economist may study market valuations and formulate their laws, but unless he takes a wider sweep he will be more likely to miss the point than to hit it. What kind of political economy abstracted from all ethical considerations could have been taught in this country before the Emancipation Proclamation? The inherent inconsistency of a slave population was made apparent even in Mill's great work. A controversy over the mere classification of economics and sociology is apt to be a barren affair, and in the meantime vigorous workers can gain victories under either flag. There is no patriotism in science. There may be economists who doubt the possibility of framing a precise definition of sociology because it looks to the welfare of society as a whole, and not from a definite angle. It is, however, quite needless to enter into a discussion of this question at the present time, but the sociologists can best answer it by giving a good account of themselves.

GARRETT DROPPERS

BOSTON, MASS.

Wage-Earners' Budgets: A Study of Standards and Cost of Living in New York City. By LOUISE BOLARD MOORE. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1907. 8vo, pp x+280.

As Resident Fellow during the years 1903-5 at Greenwich House, a social settlement on the lower west side of New York City, the author has made a detailed neighborhood study of the living expenses, and social and economic condition of 200 wage-earners' families. The families selected are racially and industrially miscellaneous in character, with incomes from \$250 to \$2,556 a year, including families of petty shop-keepers, skilled and unskilled workmen, and of the very poor. The information is presented, so far as possible, in the form of statistical tables of occupation, nativity, income, and expenditure. Detailed analysis of family expenditures